

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL BOARD – WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
July 21 st , 2014 9:00 a.m. <hr/> Next Board Meeting September 22, 2014 9:00 a.m.	604 W 6960 S Training Room	<u>Board Members:</u> Chair Sabrina Petersen, Scott Bracken, Jim Brass, Patrick Leary, Aimee Newton, Coralee Moser, Jim Bradley, <u>Excused:</u> Patrick Leary, Sam Granato, Dama Barbour <u>District Staff:</u> Pam Roberts, Stuart Palmer, Gaylyn Larsen, Lorna Vogt, Gavin Anderson, Whitney Mecham, Bill Hobbs, Larry Chipman, Craig Adams <u>Public:</u> Kerri Nakamura

AGENDA

- 1. Consent Items: (Approval Requested)**
 - 1.1. May 27, 2014 Public Hearing Minutes
 - 1.2. May 27, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes
 - 1.3. Abatements and Refunds

- 2. Meeting Open for Public Comments** (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)

- 3. Business Items**
 - 3.1. Policy for Fee Reduction when Suspending Services Seasonally, Gavin Anderson, Legal Counsel & Pam Roberts, Executive Director (**Approval Requested**)
 - 3.2. Policy for Fee Waiver, Gavin Anderson (**Approval Requested**)
 - 3.3. Policy for Mid-Year Budget Review, Gavin Anderson (**Approval Requested**)
 - 3.4. Recommendations on the Annual Area Cleanup Schedule, Lorna Vogt, Deputy Director (**Direction Requested**)
 - 3.5. Cancellation of August 25th Meeting, Pam Roberts (**Approval Requested**)

- 4. Informational Items**
 - 4.1. 2014 Second Quarter Financial Report, Stuart Palmer, Controller
 - 4.2. Update on 2011 & 2012 3rd Party Liability Claims Paid Out in 2013 & 2014, Pam Roberts
 - 4.3. Monthly Loss Report, Lorna Vogt
 - 4.4. Truck Wraps Promoting Green Waste Program, Pam Roberts
 - 4.5. Follow-up on Murray City Questions for Service, Lorna Vogt

- 5. Requested items for the Next Board Meeting on Monday, September 22, 2014**
 - 1st Draft 2015 Budget
 - 2014 Performance Measures Report

- Healthcare Benefits Survey Report

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
1.Consent Items (Approval Requested)			
1.1 May 27, 2014 Public Hearing Minutes	No changes needed to the minutes.	Motion: Board Member Bracken, seconded by Board Member Brass Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)	Approved July 21, 2014
1.2 May 27, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes	No changes needed to the minutes.	Motion: Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Newton Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)	Approved July 21, 2014
1.3 Abatements and Refunds	<p>Board Chair Petersen noted that the abatement and refund amounts are beginning to go down.</p> <p>Pam Roberts stated that these amounts are “normal” as part of the homeowners catching incorrect billing on their notices which we then correct. She stated that the balance due for 2014 is deducted from their refund so we make sure to collect what is due in 2014 before we refund any money. The highlighted portion on the handout is what we would refund after the 2014 fees.</p> <p>Pam clarified that the first line item was incorrectly billed as two units.</p> <p>Board Chair Petersen voiced concern about customers using a second can for only a few months and then requesting a refund.</p> <p>Lorna Vogt responded that we do verification when we can. We check archived records and also drive by to check if they have 2 cans on the property being used.</p> <p>Board Member Moser asked when we will begin refunding for only a year.</p> <p>Pam Roberts responded that we will be requesting that to begin January 1, 2015.</p>	<p>Board Member Jim Bradley arrived at 9:02 a.m.</p> <p>Motion: Board Member Moser, seconded by Board Member Bracken Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	Approved July 21, 2014

2. Meeting Open for Public Comments (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)			
	No Comments	Board Chair Petersen moved forward to Business Items.	
3. Business Items			
3.1 Policy for Fee Reduction when Suspending Services Seasonally, Gavin Anderson, Legal Counsel & Pam Roberts, Executive Director (Approval Requested)	<p>Board Chair Petersen voiced concern that Board Member Leary was not present to address these items. Pam Roberts confirmed that she had spoken to him and he had no concerns pertaining to the business items.</p> <p>Gavin Anderson presented that there are two ways in which fees could be reduced: if the property is vacant or if the areas where the services are reduced due to seasons. This second situation pertains to Big Cottonwood Canyon in Cardiff Fork. We found it appropriate to reduce the fee in those circumstances since we remove our services there in the winter months. Historically the district would only charge a half fee on second homes, typically cabin/canyon properties. The amended portion of the proposed policy is in red below:</p> <p>15.1.2.C.3.4 Service fees may be reduced to fifty percent of the regular charge <u>if district services are suspended on a seasonal basis.</u></p> <p><u>15.1.2.C.3.4.1 A reduction in service charges under this policy may be terminated at any time and without notice upon the Director receiving information that the property is not eligible for reduced charges.</u></p> <p>Board Member Bracken asked if there is any appeal process if they disagree with the action.</p> <p>Gavin responded that the person can ask the director personally for a change, but that is as formal an appeal process that we have laid out.</p>	Legal Counsel Gavin Andersen arrived at 9:05 a.m.	

Board Chair Petersen stated that Cardiff Fork is the only area that we actually go in and remove the cans so this policy makes sense and is straightforward.

Board Member Moser stated that she thinks that the wording in this proposed policy conveys the message clearly and simply and meets Board Member Leary's earlier requests. She also asked for clarification concerning the ability of the 321 properties that will experience a rate increase to avail themselves completely of our services.

Gavin responded that currently those 321 properties pay a half fee due to historical practices. This policy amendment is limiting that blanket reduction for all second residences. These 321 residences will still have access to our services. Whether they avail themselves from using our services, they still have to pay the full fee.

Pam stated that in the resolution we have the authority to assess a fee regardless of the service level. If you reside in the district, you pay the full fee. The whole community benefits, much like you pay for public education or the public bus system even if you are not utilizing it.

Gavin wanted the board to note that Section 6 is the existing policy based on state statute that provides a legal basis for the district to impose this fee change.

Board Member Newton asked if we anticipate receiving flak from the 321 properties that receive a fee increase.

Pam responded that we do anticipate concerns and we will notify those property owners to let them know about the resolution. She recommended that we make this effective January 1, 2015 so we have time to notify them and give them the opportunity to attend a board meeting and respond.

Motion: Board Member Newton, **seconded by** Board Member Moser

Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)

**Approved
July 21, 2014**

3.2 Policy for Fee Waiver, Gavin Anderson (Approval Requested)

Gavin stated that this policy is a result of an earlier suggestion from Board Member Leary. It is based on county practice where directors have the authority to waive fees in nominal amounts. There are a few fees pertaining to our district that would benefit from this policy where Pam, with the ACB's authority, would be able to waive minimal fees. One example is the voucher program in which the district provides vouchers in city halls and through community councils that customers can use to get a free trailer or truck load dump at the landfill.

Pam stated that we provide these vouchers for up to 2% of the number of homes in each area, including unincorporated townships and each city in our district, other than Murray. No vouchers are dropped off in Murray. The community council members hand them out to people who request them and post on their websites that they are available. These vouchers are available year round now. They used to only be available one month in the spring and one month in the fall. The code enforcement officers from Salt Lake County have also come and picked some up for targeted areas like Kearns or Magna to help clean up problem properties.

Board Chair Petersen stated that we do need to come up with a way to make them accessible to our customers in Murray.

Board Member Newton asked if we could partner with the Murray waste collector.

Board Member Moser asked Board Member Brass if they are an owner of TransJordan. Board Member Brass confirmed that they are part owners.

Pam stated that the problem is making that the vouchers are accessible for those 2800 homes in the district. We

	<p>could keep them at City Hall or she could work with Doug Hill to figure out the best way to implement this and inform those homeowners that this service is available.</p> <p>Gavin mentioned that this authority to waive fees would also apply to promotional events.</p> <p>Board Chair Petersen stated that we provided a few green cans to promote our green waste program this past year.</p> <p>Pam mentioned that we will do drawings when out in the community for a free green trailer rental to promote green waste collection. Things like this are very minimal. The voucher program is funded annually.</p> <p>Stuart Palmer confirmed that less than \$2000 in vouchers are being used annually. We can fund up to \$34,000 worth of vouchers within our annual budget.</p> <p>Board Member Newton asked if we could advertise the vouchers on the bills.</p> <p>Lorna Vogt confirmed that is possible to implement and is a great idea.</p> <p>Board Member Bradley asked for a definition of “promotional events”.</p> <p>Pam responded with an example that we targeted areas to promote the green waste area and provided a few free cans. Or having a drawing for a green trailer at a community event.</p>	<p>Motion: Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Bracken Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	<p>Approved July 21, 2014</p>
<p>3.3 Policy for Mid-Year Budget Review, Gavin Anderson (Approval Requested)</p>	<p>Board Chair Petersen stated that in the last meeting Board Member Brass had strongly suggested that we have a mid-year budget review.</p> <p>Gavin stated that this type of policy has origins in the county process. By state law, there are certain elements</p>		

required in a district budgeting process. Our existing policy is based on that state statute. There is no specific state statutory process for opening a mid-year budget review. We have the legal authority to designate that we will have a mid-year budget review and the time when that will occur. It will be up to the ACB to decide what will be included in a mid-year budget review.

Pam explained that item 5.1.6 is highlighted in the handout because she is the official Budget Officer but has designated Stuart to provide the quarterly financial report to the Board due to our requirement under state statute to show our financial position to the Board. The 2nd quarter report can be referred to as the mid-year budget review by the Board. She wanted to make sure that captured the requests from the last ACB meeting.

Board Member Bracken suggested we change the wording in 5.1.7 from “the second quarter report for each annual budget shall be considered the mid-year budget review by the Board” to “the second quarter report for each annual budget may be considered the mid-year budget review by the Board.”

Pam stated that there were a few board members that previously requested we do this and that some municipalities do this as well.

Board Member Bracken said that they do a mid-year budget adjustment.

Board Member Brass clarified that he hadn’t imagined us re-opening the budget, but really just reviewing the budget to see where we are at and can catch things that we may need to change. This is not meant to pick at every little thing, but just provides us a chance to look at how we are spending our money. A budget opening would be different and would be done in cases when we receive a grant.

Board Member Bradley is concerned about how budget

items will be prioritized when looking at the budget outside the regular budget cycle and is unsure if this policy addresses that issue. The Board can always determine if something needs to be addressed mid-budget cycle or if it needs to be put on hold until later.

Gavin agreed that authority is inherent in the Board's authority.

Board Member Bracken asked if there is a statutory requirement that we do a mid-year budget review.

Pam answered no, but there is a requirement for a quarterly report to the Board and we would only need to add this mid-year review with the Board's request.

Board Chair Petersen stated that if we want to do this it just makes sense to use the second quarter report.

Board Member Bradley stated that it might be useful to have a vote from the board after the review to see if everyone wants to do a budget adjustment.

Board member Bracken says that would put us too late in the budget cycle. He stated that he understands what Board Member Bradley stated as what we do during the quarterly budget review anyways, so he is unsure if we need to put this mid-year review in as policy if we are just reviewing the budget and not amending it.

Board Member Brass stated this idea came about after the last adoption of a new FTE and how that would affect the budget.

Board Member Bradley asked what is the downside of doing this out of habit rather than making it policy.

Board Chair Petersen stated that it is required by state statute that we review the quarterly financial reports. We took direction from the last ACB meeting that we might want to look into the mid-year one a little more closely.

She asked Stuart Palmer if his preparation for this quarter report was any different than others. Stuart responded that it was the same level of preparation and the same information.

Board Chair Petersen stated that by putting this policy in place it gives the Board more responsibility to look closer at the budget mid-year.

No changes will be made to 5.1.6.but we would be adding 5.1.7: “The second quarter report for each annual budget shall be considered the mid-year budget review by the Board.”

Board Member Moser asked for clarification. The intent is to say the 2nd quarter report will be the mid-year budget review and if we change the wording from “shall” to “may”, do we even need this 5.1.7 line at all? Is it necessary to add this if we are doing this anyway in reviewing the quarterly reports?

Gavin says the only thing it really would accomplish is that policies are educational as well as regulatory. So that by stating this, there is an educational value to board members to look at it with more detail.

Board Member Bradley stated that the term “mid-year budget review” can mean many things and suggests that we would be seeing different information than we do during the quarter reports.

Board Member Moser said it would be beneficial to have a definition for the term of “mid-year budget review” to include.

Board Member Bradley stated he was unsure if you need to define what a mid-year budget review is, but does feel that when there is a new allocation, such as an FTE, then it needs to be reviewed within the budget.

Board Chair Petersen stated that the board needs to decide if there is value in adding 5.1.7.

<p>3.4 Recommendations on the Annual Area Cleanup Schedule, Lorna Vogt, Deputy Director (Direction Requested)</p>	<p>Board Member Bradley says there is not value in adding it if there is no definition.</p> <p>Board Member Brass suggested that we postpone the entire decision to a later date until we come up with a definition.</p> <p>Pam Roberts requested a little more direction. Board Member Bracken responded that maybe the definition would include looking at large capital purchases, big budget items, evaluation of FTE allocations, any requests that may arise, etc.</p> <p>Lorna stated that the handout is an analysis preview for 2015 and is to provide the board with an update on what we have been doing the last few years. Our area cleanup program is our most popular program. The only reason for not receiving a perfect rating is that our customers want more of it. In 2010, at the request of the Board, we implemented a 4 year rotating schedule to allow every community to have one spring and one fall cleanup in that 4 year rotation. At that time, our program manager Ryan Dyer set up a schedule and we adjusted the ratio of containers to homes to meet our demand and capacity. We are now in our final year of the rotation and are looking for direction from the Board. As a heads-up, for 2015 we will be looking to the Board to decide if we should continue the 4 year rotation schedule or not. Lorna stated that there are a changing number of trucks on the road depending on maintenance costs, fuel costs, and wage increases that are all variables that make it difficult to get a base line for data.</p> <p>Board Member Bracken asked if we travel the same amount of area each day.</p> <p>Lorna responded that we do. With the rotating schedule, we start and end in a</p>	<p>Motion to Table with Direction to Staff to Define “Mid Year Budget Review”: Board Member Bradley, seconded by Board Member Bracken Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	
--	---	--	--

different city which affects the schedule of how efficiently we can get around the area.

Bills Hobbs, our Trailer Program Manager, created a static comparison called the base miles. This shows how many miles a truck would accumulate if driving the rotational schedule. When you add up all the miles we run, which equates to the days we are on the road, it does make a significant difference. This year we are expecting to save \$300,000-400,000. The route we are running this year is the most efficient route and was the original route before the 4 year rotation started when the program began.

Pam mentioned that it was the public and political will that created the 4 year rotation schedule.

Board Member Bradley asked for a definition for the Alternative Area Cleanup Program.

Lorna responded that in 2010 Big Cottonwood Canyon had an area cleanup that we realized the ski resorts were using, not the residents. From this, Bill Hobbs came up with a system where we provide trailers so that every resident in Big Cottonwood Canyon gets to use one trailer every year. This year we decided to do that with Emigration Canyon as well. This is the Alternative Area Cleanup Program, which is designed for the canyon areas. This schedule is up to the residents, not a set rotating schedule. It has been well received and the Community Council really likes it. Only 2% of the residents in Emigration have used it but we anticipate more in July. We take it specifically to the person who needs it and has requested it. The Community Council paid for "Chipper Days" previously but this year they will purchase on demand trailers that residents can use to dispose of materials.

Board Member Newton said that while working for Taylorsville she noticed many residents that were upset by the rotating schedule because they couldn't plan on

the same time every year. It may be easier to just have a set schedule.

Pam stated that is was a set schedule prior to 2011. We are proposing going back to a set schedule that is the most efficient and cost effective.

Board Chair Petersen said she never received complaints until we changed to the rotating schedule in Holladay.

Pam said that we send out postcards notifying residents when their area cleanup dates are scheduled at the first of the year and there is also a look up tool on the website. In the past we averaged an 88% customer satisfaction rating and it has consistently dropped down to 81% in 2013 mostly because customers didn't know when the program was in their neighborhood. The consistency of a set schedule will be beneficial to the customers. It is also the most cost effective and efficient route. We are proposing we go back to that set schedule.

Board Member Bracken asked how the costs change if we are just changing the start and end places.

Lorna provided an example of moving 131 containers from Herriman to another part of the valley is difficult without using a staging day which then uses 2 days to move the containers completely. The miles add up and cause it to be more expensive as well as the number of employees needed. Every day we can reduce will save us roughly \$14,000.

Pam stated that it is important to note that the containers are stored at Welby Pit for the winter which affects the distance we have to drive when we start and finish since it is closest to West Jordan.

Pam noted that we do offer special cleanups as well. Taylorsville has utilized it the most. Herriman and the townships have requested price quotes for this option as well. Cities can choose to do this if needed to offset the

regular area cleanup schedule.

Board Member Moser stated that she has had residents use the voucher program to help offset the area cleanup schedule as well when they need to.

Bill Hobbs stated that the only consistent data for comparing different area's usage of the containers is for green waste, where more developed areas such as Cottonwood Heights produce a higher volume of green waste due to the age and size of the trees.

Board Member Bradley asked if we pick anything up outside of a container.

Lorna said we do that for green waste if there is a large amount, they can call in, put it on their yard and we will hand load the green waste. This is part of area cleanup program.

Board Member Newton asked if it is possible to post that option on the area cleanup containers because they fill up a lot of the times.

Lorna said that is a great idea and easily doable.

Pam stated that when we bring the proposed 2015 Budget forward we will include the costs for area cleanup and will follow the Board's direction if they would like to return to a set schedule.

Board Member Bracken stated he needs to take this to his city council and see what they want to do.

The Board agreed to cancel the August 25th meeting.

3.5 Cancellation of August 25th Meeting, Pam Roberts (Approval Requested)

Motion: Board Member Bradley, **seconded by** Board Member Moser
Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)

4. Informational Items

4.1 2014 Second Quarter Financial Report, Stuart Palmer, Controller

Stuart Palmer, Controller, presented the Second Quarter Financial Report.

Residential Waste Collections is at 42.1% of the budget expended. Total Revenue is 44.3% of budget expended. This is almost the exactly the same percentage as last year.

Jim Bradley asked if in a perfect world, all of the percent of budget expended would be 50% for each category.

Stuart confirmed that is true.

Stuart stated that we are trying to determine what a pattern is for us due to differences that arise from when we certify and how we bill.

We have recognized \$856,952 from the sale of trucks this year. Total revenue shows that we have more revenue at this time this year than last year.

For personnel expenses, wages/salaries are at 47.6% of budget expended. Temp labor is at 35.7%. The temp labor comes from office and area cleanup positions.

Board Chair Petersen asked Stuart how these numbers are affected by the FTE approval from the last meeting. Stuart answered that those numbers are not shown in this report. That new allocation was effective July 1st and will show up in the third and fourth quarter.

Retirement Pension increased by 1.25% for the District, County and in all the cities.

Health insurance is at 50.5% of budget expended.

Workers comp claims is at 77.4% of budget expended. We've had a large claim that carried over from last year. There have been some claims that have been paid out during this quarter making our percentage higher than

usual.

Overall payroll is at \$2.9 million while last year it was \$2.6 million. This increase is due to raises, pensions and the increase of healthcare costs. The personnel costs are solid but workers comp claims are the hard ones to predict.

Operating Costs:

The CNG conversion is having a positive effect on fuel costs.

Truck Maintenance costs are very much in line with where they should be.

Disposal fees increased due to the 19% increase from the landfill on January 1, 2014.

County overhead is at 100% for the second half of the 2012 overhead payments. This was the 2nd of the two installments.

Building rental is at 85.1%. We will increase our floor space this fall when Fleet moves out. We outgrew the space so we are anticipating taking over 4 of the offices.

Property and insurance claims- we have paid our annual premium.

Total expenditures at 47.5% year to date. We are in good shape financially and very similar to last year.

Capital Expenditures- At the first of the year we shifted our capital purchases and have purchased 10 trucks this year.

Cash Balance is healthy this year at \$14 million. The change compared to last year is because we bought trucks in 2nd quarter this year, last year balance was \$16 million but we bought trucks in the 3rd quarter of 2013.

Our cash position is currently very strong.

<p>4.2 Update on 2011 & 2012 3rd Party Liability Claims Paid Out in 2013 & 2014, Pam Roberts</p>	<p>Pam explained why we have exceeded this particular line item, even though we are within budget overall. In 2013 we found we had outstanding 3rd party liability claims from 2011 that we needed to settle. Pam worked with Deputy DA Darcy Goddard to get these claims settled at as low of a cost as possible for the district. We had 2 cases requiring outside mediation. The first one the plaintiff claimed \$50,000 in damages; \$10,100 was paid to the plaintiff and \$900 paid for mediation fees, equaling an \$11,000 total settlement. The 2nd case that required outside mediation was from our truck rear-ending a sedan. Both people in the sedan claimed injuries and demanded \$180,000 in damages. In 2014, we paid \$50,500 to the plaintiff, \$1,350 for mediation fees, totaling \$51,850.</p> <p>2 smaller cases were settled by the DA's office without mediation. These 4 cases have been closed for a grand total of \$76,350 paid out in 2014. Any upcoming cases will be handled by the Utah Local Governments Trust and paid through our insurance.</p>		
<p>4.3 Monthly Loss Report, Lorna Vogt</p>	<p>Lorna presented the Monthly Loss Report. This tracks our monthly auto claims and workers comp claims.</p> <p>These are the actual costs of the claims closed this month. Some may carry over from a previous month. This does give a good idea of how many claims we are paying and the amounts.</p> <p>Equipment Repairs are what we pay when one of our bumpers gets bent or a light bar gets hit by a tree. They are costs of business repairs and are tagged as equipment repairs rather than accidents.</p> <p>We have created this monthly loss report historically. This has stemmed from working with the Utah Local Governments Trust to reduce our losses. By doing so we can earn a rebate and an award from the Trust.</p>		

	<p>The workers comp claims are just small claims paid out thus far.</p>		
<p>4.4 Truck Wraps Promoting Green Waste Program, Pam Roberts</p>	<p>Pam presented the new truck wrap developed with Neptune Strategies that features the “trio” to promote recycling and the green waste program. This new wrap will go on 5 trucks, and grow to 10 trucks in 2015. Parents Empowered wraps will continue to be on our trucks. We are partnering with SLCO for their recycling campaign that is on 14 trucks as well. The Board liked the new truck wrap so we will proceed to roll it out.</p>		
<p>4.5 Follow-Up on Murray City Questions for Service, Lorna Vogt</p>	<p>Lorna stated that the question is what if we service all of Murray rather than just the 2800 homes that we currently service. Shout out to Ryan Dyer, our Recycling Services Manager, for putting together this analysis.</p> <p>The major difference is where we take the waste. Since Murray is a member of Transjordan it seems logical to take the waste to Transjordan. Transjordan is across the valley from Murray so it ends up with an additional full route and one more truck, resulting in an extra 1.5 hours to each truck per day. The biggest differences when compared to the transfer station would be fewer miles, trucks and lower disposal costs. Murray also owns all of their carts and does their servicing. If they would continue doing that, it would provide a reduction in costs for us.</p> <p>Board Chair Petersen asked for clarification on the purchase of carts. Lorna replied that this analysis does not include the large cost that would be needed if we had to purchase carts. It is included at the bottom of the report to show the additional costs that would occur.</p> <p>Board Member Brass stated that Murray is a part owner of Transjordan. He is unsure if whoever contracts with Murray to service the area are required or not to dump at Transjordan. They receive a reduced dumping fee at Transjordan.</p>		

Board Chair Petersen asked if we brought Murray in would we need to raise their rate to supplement the additional cost.

Lorna stated that this data is based on the standard fee charged currently.

Pam asked Stuart if the current \$14.75 covers all costs for services. Stuart confirmed that it does not cover all costs but other sales we have supplement the cost. If we were to submit a bid, the startup costs are significant. We would have to purchase additional trucks and possibly carts.

Board Member Brass stated that they do not pick up in apartment complexes or PUDs currently in Murray.

Board Member Bradley asked if Murray asked us to look into this or are we taking the initiative?

Pam responded that it came up in the board meeting when Murray was considering de-annexation of the homes we service. The Board asked us to look into how much it would cost since the Murray contract is up for bid next year.

Board Member Brass stated that we are welcome to bid but it will come down to price comparisons.

Pam stated that the question is about expanding the district's area. Unlike the UPD or UFA, when we expand we cannot absorb existing resources. We would need to increase the fleet and employees, which means significant startup costs.

Gavin stated that in order for it to become a formal annexation into the district the city council must get involved to do that. The city can contract with the district otherwise.

Scott Bracken excused at 10:30 a.m.

	Board Member Moser mentioned that maybe look at minor rerouting that could help deal with those startup costs.		
5. Requested Items for Next Meeting on Monday, September 22, 2014			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Draft 2015 Budget • 2014 Performance Measures Report • Healthcare Benefits Survey Report 		
ADJOURN		Motion: Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Moser Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present).	